(7)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT JABALPUR

WRIT PETITION No.2642/2000.
(WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226/227 OF THE CONSTITUTION ON INDIA)

PETITIONERS:

1. MAHESH KUMAR ROHELA
S/o Shri Bhagwandas Rohela
aged about 35 years,
R/o Katora Talab,
Raipur Distt.Raipur(MP).

2. Janakraj Jaggi,
S/o Shri Hari Kishan Jaggi
aged about 65 years,
R/o R.K. Bekri, Station Road, Raipur (MP).

3. Hasmukh Khasgiwala
S/o Shri S.F. Khasgiwala,
aged about 49 years,
R/o C-41, New Bombay Market,
Raipur Distt. Raipur(MP).

4. Gurmit Singh Saini
S/o Pritam Singh Saini,
aged about 52 years,
R/o D-21, Bombay Market,
Raipur (MP).

5. Jashpal Singh Bachwani,
S/o Shri Dulichand Bachwani
aged about 30 years,
R/o Sindhi Camp, Tilda,
District, Raipur (MP).

6. Niranjan Singh
S/o Dhillan
aged about 63 years,
New Cloth Market,
Pandri, Raipur(MP)

7. Manohar Lal Sonwani,
S/o Dukalharam Sonwani,
aged about 33 years,
R/o Dhamtari Road,
Devpuri,Raipur(MP).

//Versus//

RESPONDENTS:

1. RAIPUR DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY, A body incorporated under Section-38 of Nagar Tatha Gram Nivesh Adhiniyam, having it's office at G.E. Road, Raipur (MP).

2. The Chairman,
Raipur Development Authority,Raipur(MP).

3. Tahsildar,
(Recovery Officer),
Raipur Development Authority,Raipur(MP).

Surendra Kumar Khare
S.K.Khare
16/1
Oath Commissioner HBP.

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226/227 OF THE CONSTITUTION ON INDIA

100

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE CHHATTISGARH: BILASPUR

Single Bench: Hon'ble Shri Satish K. Agnihotri, J.

W. P. No. 2642 of 2000

Petitioners : Mahesh Kumar Rohela & Others.

Versus

Respondents : Raipur Development Authority, And others.

Shri Goutam Bhaduri, counsel for the petitioners.

Shri B.P. Sharma, counsel for respondents No.1 and 2.

Smt. Anju Ahuja, Deputy Government Advocate for the respondent No.3.

ORAL ORDER

(12th May, 2006)

1. I.A. No. 5007/2006, this is an application for withdrawal of the writ petition. Learned counsel appearing for the respondents have no objection, if the application is allowed.

2. In view of the averments made in the application, the application is ordered, as prayed for.

2. Consequently, the writ petition is dismissed as withdrawn. No order as to costs.

Sd/-
Satish K. Agnihotri
Judge

Gowri